



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

when they are baldly stated by a frankly skeptical reviewer. He is rather fond of the old-fashioned 'omnibus' sentence—with long riotous relative clauses, and many parentheses and quotations imbedded even in these. Even after a long practice in reporting *Germanorum obscura reperta* for the readers of this Journal, I have found it hard at times to make out his precise meaning. Still, I have tried not to misrepresent or misquote. Perhaps his study of Virgil—like Tennyson's famous hexameters—is 'no worse than' some recent studies of the Eclogues that 'daring Germany sent us'. But neither is it any better, and, like them, it should be 'used with caution'.

W. P. MUSTARD.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Centaur in Ancient Art. The Archaic Period. By PAUL V. C. BAUR. Berlin, Karl Curtius, 1912.

This book is another illustration of the fact that cataloguing is one of the most important tasks of the archaeologist as well as the best training for him. Professor Baur's book is not a catalogue of any particular collection or museum, but of the various types of centaur from the earliest times down to the end of the archaic period, 480 B. C. Three classes are distinguished: centaurs with equine forelegs, centaurs with human forelegs, and centaurs with human forelegs ending in hoofs—the last type, an Aeolic invention, short-lived and represented by only eight examples (Nos. 318–326). The unique case of a statuette of a centaur with human hindlegs as well as forelegs (No. 300) is explained as a mere artist's whim. The examples are arranged according to locality and in chronological order, but groups are formed of various mythological subjects. In some cases monuments later than 480 B. C. have been included, where the types were important for an understanding of earlier times. The earliest representations, of which three are given, are in Babylonia, where they are either purely decorative or have power to ward off evil. In the Minoan monuments no centaur is found, strange to say. Not until the geometric period is the centaur introduced into Greece, derived probably from the Hittites, to whom Baur traces much oriental influence in the representation of centaurs, thinking that the Etruscan and Greek representations often drew directly from a common oriental source which was Hittite (cf. pp. 112, 119, 120, 121 et passim). In the early geometric period (900–750) the centaur has not yet mythological significance. By the end of the eighth century (cf. No. 203) we have the first mythological subject connected with the centaurs, and from that time on legends concerning the centaurs become more and more wide-spread,

until we have the stories of Heracles and the centaurs, the adventure with Nessus, which was very popular, Pholus welcoming Heracles, the opening of the *pitthos*, Pholus entertaining Heracles, the centauroomachy on Mt. Pholoe, the Thessalian centauroomachy, especially the episode with Caeneus, Peleus wrestling with Thetis before Chiron, the wedding of Peleus and Thetis with Chiron offering congratulations, Peleus bringing the child Achilles to Chiron, Hermes bringing the child Achilles to Chiron, Chiron teaching Achilles to throw the lance, Chiron sacrificing, centaurs hunting, combat between two centaurs, and purely decorative centaurs. The exact origin of the centaur as well as the etymology of the word is not known, although Baur frequently speaks of the Hittites as the originators. But we cannot be sure of this until we know more about the Hittites. The main value of Baur's catalogue, aside from the fact that it is the first exhaustive study of the centaur in archaic art, consists in proving that the earliest type of centaur is not that with human forelegs, but rather that with equine forelegs—a statement repeated over and over again throughout the book. Both types were known to the Greeks from the beginning, and occur together on a geometric stamped gold band from Corinth (No. 5), for which, as well as for No. 199, a reference might have been given also to Furtwängler's *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 458 f. (pls. 15, 16).

The book is well illustrated with thirty-eight figures and fifteen plates, all good except fig. 17 and pl. iv, 308, which are not clear. Several unpublished monuments are included; that on pl. xiii, 219, with no acknowledgment to Maraghiannis or the discoverers. Many reproductions are due to Dr. Sieveking of Munich, and considerable material was contributed by Professor Zahn, who had also made a collection of centaurs. It is remarkable that of the 326 numbers in the catalogue, over three-fourths are vases; and in discussing these Professor Baur has shown a thorough mastery of the history of Greek vase-painting and the various styles.

There are some points about which one might differ from Professor Baur, but the book is unusually free from errors of fact. The confusion of right and left, which is so frequent in archaeological publications, occurs often. A few instances which I have noticed are p. 32, No. 83, left hand for right hand; p. 33, No. 84, the one to the right, for the one to the left; p. 73, No. 191, right arm for left arm, and left arm for right arm; p. 82, No. 211, in first sentence, right for left and left for right; p. 85, No. 217, left for right hand and right for left; p. 106, No. 257, left hand for right hand; p. 122, No. 307, Baur has uplifted right and extended left arm, where the new catalogue of the vases in Munich, p. 103, has just the opposite, and the second centaur has a branch in his right hand rather than in the left; p. 75, second paragraph, the reference should be to p. 508, not 506; and for Hollaux read Holleaux, and or Homolle *bis* read Holleaux. Misprints also are rare, but

p. 65, l. 6, read *Monuments funéraires* for *Monuments funéraire*; pp. 66 and 74 butt end would be better than "but end"; p. 73 read *Macdonald* for *MacDonald* *bis*; and *Babelon Traité* ii, 1, p. 1115, for *Babelon Traité* p. 1115; p. 101 read about to receive for "about the receive"; p. 124, No. 308, the poor illustration on pl. iv seems to show that *Heracles* is not in the background and is not concealed by the equine back of the centaur; p. 124, No. 310, *Heracles*' right knee is almost touching the ground, rather than actually touching it; p. 129 read 'his arguments seem' for 'his arguments seems'. Despite some Germanisms (cf. p. 89, 'Rosette form'; p. 102, 'Herakles and Achilles episodes'; p. 135, cf. the many similar formations and 'the earliest centaur type', etc., all without even hyphens to connect them), and despite a few rather bad expressions, such as 'the equine legged centaurs', or 'the equine forelegged centaurs', or 'a human forelegged centaur', or 'the change from human to equine forelegged centaurs', or 'hind-and left foreleg' (cf. pp. 7, 76, 86, 89, 99, et passim), the book is very readable, considering that it is a catalogue, and extremely suggestive. It is right up-to-date, referring on p. 84 to the Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum for April, 1912, and to the fine new catalogue by Sieveking-Hackl, of the *Münchener Vasensammlung*. We should also prefer references to the second edition of Head's *Hist. Num.* (cf. pp. 72, 73, 83, etc.); and to Reinach, *Rép. Stat. IV*, pp. 320, 441; and for No. 21 we should like a reference to Nicole, *Cat. des Vases Peints du Musée Nat. d'Athènes*, Suppl., No. 907. We should also like consistency in referring to plates, Arabic numerals now being used and Roman at other times; and the lack of consecutiveness in the numbers on the plates is confusing (so, for example, No. 311 is on pl. I, and No. 14 on pl. xii). Even the recent dissertation of Oelschig, *De centaumachiae in arte graeca figuris* (1911) was available, and on pp. 138 f. Baur gives his additions. Baur's list is unusually complete. I have noticed few omissions. Leroux, *Vases de Madrid*, p. 24; Reinach, *Rép. Stat. IV*, p. 441, 1; BSA XIV, p. 297; an unedited terra-cotta Centaur with human forelegs in Baltimore. But it would not be fair to continue such strictures. Professor Baur deserves praise for this excellent piece of research, and this catalogue should be in every library of archaeology and art and in every important museum. The price, ten dollars, which is too much for a book of only 140 pages and with no expensive reproductions, will prevent most private individuals from purchasing it. Let us hope that Professor Baur will continue this valuable study from archaic times down to the Roman period, and conclude with a good index, which is lacking in the present volume.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.